

From: [HOPE Bruce](#)
To: [PETERSON Jenn L](#); [ANDERSON Jim M](#)
Cc: [Eric Blischke/R10/USEPA/US@EPA](#)
Subject: RE: Modeling Discussions
Date: 06/21/2006 03:25 PM

Jennifer,

I know there's a schedule but am not sure whether it imposes a time limitation on this T&F stuff. To me it looks like Carl & Co. are the ones in a rush. Regardless, I just can't cover-up the fact anymore that I'm not in a position to keep pace with their team. So either things slow down to accomodate the resources & time I/we have available or we just let them do their thing and try to catch-up through the usual comment/response process.

Bruce

-----Original Message-----

From: PETERSON Jenn L
Sent: Wednesday, June 21, 2006 2:27 PM
To: HOPE Bruce; ANDERSON Jim M
Cc: 'Blischke.Eric@epamail.epa.gov'
Subject: RE: Modeling Discussions

Bruce,

Is there a time limitation in place to get these things worked out? If there is, and we cannot come to a work product that satisfies both parties in that timeframe (e.g. due to conceptual differences or workload issues), it makes sense to me to direct them to do the model a certain way, at least for the initial efforts. Jim and Eric?

-Jennifer

-----Original Message-----

From: HOPE Bruce
Sent: Wednesday, June 21, 2006 1:50 PM
To: ANDERSON Jim M; PETERSON Jenn L
Cc: Blischke.Eric@epamail.epa.gov
Subject: FW: Modeling Discussions

Jim / Jennifer,

Carl keeps sending these messages directly to me and seems to think that I'm going to show up at this meeting on Tuesday without an EPA counterpart. Not going to happen.

Beyond that, how am I (and by extension, the Agency team) supposed to understand and agree to the numerous changes they made in this document in time for Tuesday's meeting? I skimmed the changes they suggested and they are assuming that almost all of the flow calculations will be stripped out of the T&F model and done exclusively by the hydrodynamic model. I thought the idea of "hybrid" was that the T&F model will use data from the hydro model to better inform its calculations but will still be a stand-alone that can run faster than the hydro model so managers can work with it in real time. Otherwise, you're shackling yourself to a 60+ hour turn-around time and might as well just use only the hydro model. What they've got here isn't a hybrid, it's a takeover. They've also blown past any chance I'd have to revise the existing T&F/FW models/document in response to Ray's comments, my interactions with Nancy & John, and my discussions with the environmental modelling group at PSU.

Frankly, I have to admire them for the handy way they've re-captured control of the modeling effort. Carl's antipathy for the EPA T&F model is obvious and he has a lot to gain by making it

go away. Trying to increase the pace and detail level is, to me, a way of forcing the modeling effort so that the gov't side can't do it and it falls back into LWG's control. Because of my other responsibilities (which may include Umatilla) and DEQ's general under-staffing, I simply don't have time to keep pace with a multi-person, concerted LWG effort to do things their way. Maybe there's something noble about being out-numbered and out-gunned, but I fail to see it.

Bruce

-----Original Message-----

From: Carl Stivers [mailto:cstivers@anchorenv.com]

Sent: Wednesday, June 21, 2006 1:04 PM

To: HOPE Bruce

Cc: Keith Pine; Gene Revelas; Nancy Judd; Ray Walton; johnt@windwardenv.com

Subject: Modeling Discussions

Bruce –

In preparation for our Tuesday meeting (assuming we can get someone from EPA and it all happens) we have prepared a few notes on details we would like to at least start to discuss in the near future. I started by trying to list out the changes that might be required to existing descriptions of models based upon the agreed “hybrid model” approach. I quickly found that the easiest way to put these issues in clear context was to simply annotate your draft report on the fate and transport/food web model that you previously prepared. These annotations are attached. Please note that anything highlighted in yellow is something we would like to discuss in the upcoming meeting. Other edits I think are merely tracking the agreements that have already been made in one form or another.

Please note that our intent here is only to identify items for discussion. If you are uncomfortable with any of the changes or language in the attached document, we see plenty of opportunity for future changes to any specific language (or even the method by which we get these details recorded) that more accurately reflects your views and the outcomes of our future discussions on these items.

Hopefully, we can get some interest from EPA, and we will see you in Tuesday in Portland.

Thanks.

Carl

Carl Stivers

Anchor Environmental, L.L.C.
1423 3rd Avenue, Suite 300
Seattle, WA 98101-2226
Phone: 206-287-9130
Fax: 206-287-9131

cstivers@anchorenv.com

This electronic message transmission contains information that may be confidential and/or privileged work product prepared in anticipation of litigation. The information is intended for the use of the individual or entity named above. If you are not the intended recipient, please be aware that any disclosure, copying distribution or use of the contents of this information is prohibited. If you have received this electronic transmission in error, please notify us by telephone at (206) 287-9130, or by electronic mail, cstivers@anchorenv.com.

